

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-7, 10, and 11 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7 are amended. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

Interview on August 31, 2004

Initially, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Jennifer Nguyen for taking the time to discuss the present application with Applicant's Representative, Jason Rhodes, during the personal interview on August 31, 2004.

The substance of this interview is provided below.

Substance of the Interview

- (1) **Exhibits/Demonstrations:** No exhibit was shown and no demonstration was conducted.
- (2) **Identification of Claims Discussed:** Claim 1 and 7 were discussed.
- (3) **Identification of Prior Art Discussed:** Someya (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,931) was discussed.
- (4) **Identification of Proposed Amendments:** No amendments were initially proposed by Applicant.
- (5) **General Thrust of Principal Arguments Presented:** Someya fails to disclose adopting a characteristic that makes an input signal and conversion signal virtually equal.

- (6) **Other Pertinent Matters Discussed:** The Examiner suggested that clarifying amendments be made to claims 1 and 7.
- (7) **General Results:** An agreement was reached that claim 1 was patentably distinguished over Someya. Furthermore, the Examiner agreed that claim 7 would distinguish over Someya if amended to similarly recite adopting a characteristic that makes the supplied signal and conversion signal virtually equal.

Information Disclosure Statement of December 5, 2003

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) on December 5, 2003. In the Amendment After Final filed on March 15, 2004 (which was entered in accordance with the RCE of April 15, 2004), Applicant pointed out that the Examiner had failed to acknowledge this IDS.

However, the Examiner still has not acknowledged the IDS of December 5, 2003. Applicant respectfully urges the Examiner to acknowledge the IDS, and send an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 to the undersigned at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Amendments to Claims 1 and 7

Applicant respectfully submits that amendments were made to claims 1 and 7 in order to clarify the claimed invention. It is

respectfully submitted that these clarifying amendments were not made in response to a rejection. Thus, Applicant submits that the clarifying amendments to claims 1 and 7 were not made for a reason relating to patentability and, thus, give rise to no estoppel.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Someya. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated in the Substance of the Interview above, an agreement was reached between the Examiner and Applicant's Representative with regard to this rejection. Specifically, the Examiner agreed with Applicant's Representative that independent claim 1 patentably distinguished over Someya, and did not require further amendment to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, and that claims 4-6 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 7 now recites features, which the Examiner agreed was neither taught nor suggested by Someya during the interview. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is now in condition for

allowance, and claims 10 and 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 7.

Conclusion


In view of the above remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding claim rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in connection with the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
D. Richard Anderson, #40,439


DRA/JWR
2257-0189P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000